arXiv:1608.04600v1 [math.DS] 16 Aug 2016

.

LEBESGUE MEASURE OF ESCAPING SETS OF TRANSCENDENTAL ENTIRE FUNCTIONS IN THE EREMENKO-LYUBICH CLASS

WEIWEI CUI

Abstract. For a transcendental entire function f of finite order in the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$, we give conditions under which the Lebesgue measure of the escaping set $\mathcal{I}(f)$ of f is zero. This is inspired by the recent work of Aspenberg and Bergweiler, in which they give conditions on entire functions in the same class with escaping sets of positive Lebesgue measure. We will construct an entire function in the Eremenko-Lyubich class to show that the condition given by Aspenberg and Bergweiler is essentially sharp. Furthermore, we adapt our idea of proof to the case of infinite order entire functions. Under some restrictions to the growth of these entire functions, we show that the escaping sets have zero Lebesgue measure. This generalizes a result of Eremenko and Lyubich.

1. Introduction and main results

For a transcendental entire function f, the *Julia set* $\mathcal{J}(f)$ of f is defined to be the set of all points in $\mathbb{C}$ where the iterates f^n do not form a normal family in the sense of Montel. The complement $\mathcal{F}(f)$ of $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is called the *Fatou set*. And the *escaping set* $\mathcal{I}(f)$ of f is defined as the set of all points in $\mathbb{C}$ where the iterates f^n of f tend to ∞ as $n \to \infty$. See [Ber93] and [Sch09] for an introduction to transcendental dynamics. Even though the investigation of the Julia set and Fatou set of a transcendental entire function started from Fatou [Fat26], a thorough study of the escaping set was not undertook until Eremenko [Ere89]. Various structures of escaping sets have been investigated, from either topological, geometrical or measure-and-dimension-theoretical viewpoints. Our aim here is to study escaping sets of transcendental entire functions in view of their two-dimensional Lebesgue measure. Throughout we only consider transcendental entire functions. When we write f we always mean such function. For further discussions, we shall use the order of growth of an entire function f, which is defined as

$$\rho(f) = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log\log M(r,f)}{\log r}. \tag{1.1}$$

Here, $M(r,f)$ is the maximum modulus of f, defined by

$$M(r,f) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|.$$

We focus on a family of entire functions called *Eremenko-Lyubich class*, which is termed as *class* $\mathcal{B}$. We start with some definitions, notations and then give the definition of functions in this class. A point $a \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a *critical point* of f

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37F10 (primary), 30D05 (secondary).

if $f'(a) = 0$, and $f(a)$ is called a *critical value* of f. We say that $b \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is an *asymptotic value* of f, if there exists a curve γ tending to ∞ such that $f(\gamma)$ tends to b. A point z is called a *singularity* of f^{-1}, if it is an asymptotic value or a critical value of f. Moreover, a singularity z of f^{-1} is called a *direct singularity* if there exists a disk $D_\chi(z, r)$ with respect to the spherical metric such that f omits the value z in a component V_r of $f^{-1}(D_\chi(z, r))$ for some $r > 0$. In particular, a direct singularity is called *logarithmic* if the restriction $f : V_r \to D_\chi(z, r) \setminus \{z\}$ is a universal covering for some $r > 0$. The domain V_r is called a *direct tract* or *logarithmic tract* over z, respectively. Now we say that an entire function f is in the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$, if the set of finite singularities of f^{-1} is bounded. Thus, for $f \in \mathcal{B}$ we can find a constant, say $r_0 > 0$, such that all the singularities of f lie in $\{z : |z| \le r_0\}$. This also implies that all components of $f^{-1}(\{z : |z| \le r_0\})$ are logarithmic tracts over ∞. Without loss of generality, by choosing a suitable large constant r_0 we may assume that $|f(0)| \le r_0$. For such functions, we can apply the logarithmic change of variable, which was first introduced into transcendental dynamics by Eremenko and Lyubich [EL92]. To put this clearly, we define

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |z| > r_0\}, \\ U &= f^{-1}(A), \\ W &= \exp^{-1}(U), \\ H &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z > \log r_0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Eremenko and Lyubich [EL92, Section 2] proved that there exists $F : W \to H$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{F} & H \\ {\scriptstyle \exp}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \exp} \\ U & \xrightarrow[f]{} & A \end{array}$$

Moreover, F maps every component of W biholomorphically onto H. We say that F is obtained from f by a logarithmic change of variables.

First we recall some properties of escaping sets. For f entire, $\mathcal{I}(f)$ is non-empty [Ere89] and if, in addition $f \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\overline{\mathcal{I}(f)} = \mathcal{J}(f)$ [EL92]. Functions in this class include, for instance, λe^z and $\sin(\alpha z + \beta)$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \alpha \neq 0$. McMullen [McM87] showed that $\mathcal{I}(\sin(\alpha z + \beta))$ has positive measure. This result was substantially generalized by Aspenberg and Bergweiler [AB12] to functions in class $\mathcal{B}$ with some control on the growth of the functions. To formulate their conditions, consider the function

$$E_\beta(z) = e^{\beta z} \quad \text{for} \quad \beta \in (0, 1/e).$$

This is a real entire function with one fixed point ξ which is repelling and has multiplier $\lambda = \beta\xi > 1$. Around this repelling fixed point, Schröder's functional equation

$$\Phi\left(E_\beta(z)\right) = \lambda \Phi(z) \tag{1.3}$$

has a unique local holomorphic solution Φ normalized by $\Phi(\xi) = 0$ and $\Phi'(\xi) = 1$. The function Φ has a continuation to the positive real axis such that (1.3) still holds for $z \in [\xi, \infty)$. Note that Φ is increasing on the real axis and $\lim_{x\to\infty} \Phi(x) = \infty$. Moreover, the function Φ tends to ∞ slower than any iterate of the logarithm, in other words, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{\Phi(x)}{\log^m x} = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

Here $\log^m$ denotes the m-th iterate of the logarithm. Therefore, if we consider the function $\varepsilon_0 : (\xi, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ defined by

$$\varepsilon_0(x) = \frac{1}{\Phi(x)}, \tag{1.5}$$

then this function tends to zero but slower than $1/\log^m$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Now the result of Aspenberg and Bergweiler can be stated as follows. Let f be an entire function which has N logarithmic tracts over ∞, and suppose that

$$\log\log M(r, f) \leq \left(\frac{N}{2} + \varepsilon_0(r)\right) \log r \tag{1.6}$$

for large r. Then the escaping set of f has positive Lebesgue measure. The Denjoy-Carleman-Ahlfors theorem [GO08, p.173] implies that if the set of all z for which $|f(z)| > r_0$ has N components for some $r_0 > 0$, then the order of f is at least $N/2$. In particular, we have $\rho(f) \geq 1/2$ for $f \in \mathcal{B}$ (see [BE95]). We call condition (1.6) the *Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition*. Therefore, the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition ensures that such an entire function grows only slightly faster than guaranteed by the Denjoy-Carleman-Ahlfors theorem.

Aspenberg and Bergweiler gave an example to show that $\varepsilon_0(r)$ in (1.6) can not be replaced by a positive constant. Since this example will also be important for our later discussions, we define it here. Their example is the following *Mittag-Leffler's function*:

$$F_\alpha(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{\Gamma(\alpha n + 1)}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. This function is in class $\mathcal{B}$ with order of growth $1/\alpha > 1/2$. More importantly, it is bounded in the sector $\{re^{it} : r > 0, |t - \pi| \leq (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})\pi\}$. Then by a result of Eremenko and Lyubich [EL92, Theorem 7], the Lebesgue measure of the escaping set of the Mittag-Leffler's function is zero.

Now we will complement the above result to show that the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition is essentially sharp by constructing an entire function satisfying the following condition.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists an entire function f in class $\mathcal{B}$ with*

$$\log\log M(r, f) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\log\Phi(r)}\right) \log r + \mathcal{O}(1), \tag{1.7}$$

for which the escaping set has Lebesgue measure zero.

We compare the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition with condition (1.7). Put $E(z) = \exp(z)$ and $E^k(z) = E(E^{k-1}(z))$. Recall that the $\varepsilon(r)$ in the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition is defined in (1.5). Then it satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon\left(E^k(0)\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\Phi\left(E^k(0)\right)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^k \Phi(0)} < \infty. \tag{1.8}$$

The choice of the function $E(x)$ rather than $E_\beta(x)$ is irrelevant, see the proof in Lemma 3.7 below. For the function $1/\log(\Phi(r))$ in the above theorem, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log \Phi\left(E^k(0)\right)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k \log \lambda + \log\left(\Phi(0)\right)} = \infty.$$

Instead of $E^k(0)$ we could take $E^k(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ in (1.8). To see this, without loss of generality, suppose that $x > 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E^N(0) \geq x$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon\left(E^k\left(x\right)\right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon\left(E^k\left(E^N\left(0\right)\right)\right) = \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \varepsilon\left(E^j\left(0\right)\right) = \infty.$$

As a matter of fact, the convergence or divergence of the above series is crucial in both the work of Aspenberg and Bergweiler and our proof of the theorem. The series (1.8) converges also for $\varepsilon(x) = 1/(\log \Phi(x))^{1+\delta}$ if $\delta > 0$, and the argument of Aspenberg and Bergweiler still works in this case and shows that the conclusion of their theorem also holds in this case. Theorem 1.1 shows that this does not hold for $\delta = 0$.

Theorem 1.1 will follow from another theorem we shall give below, in which the divergence of the above series is used to show that the Lebesgue measure of escaping set is zero. Given an entire function $f \in \mathcal{B}$, we use previous notations in (1.2). Moreover, we put $V = \mathbb{C} \setminus U$, and define

$$\theta(r) = \operatorname{meas}\left\{\, t \in [0, 2\pi] : re^{it} \in V \right\}, \tag{1.9}$$

Here meas denotes the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure. Now our result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\rho(f) < 1$ and the logarithmic tract U. Let $V = \mathbb{C} \setminus U$ and θ be defined by (1.9). Suppose that there exists a positive constant R_1 with $R_1 > 2 \log r_0$ and $R_1 - \log r_0 > 64\pi$ such that*

$$W \subset \{z : \operatorname{Re} z > R_1\}. \tag{1.10}$$

Suppose that $\theta(r) \geq \theta_0(r)$ for large $r > 0$, where $\theta_0(r)$ is continuous, decreasing and satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_0\left(E^k(0)\right) = \infty. \tag{1.11}$$

Then area $\mathcal{J}(f) = 0$.

Condition (1.10) in the theorem implies that the function f is of disjoint type (for a definition of disjoint type entire functions, see, for instance, [Rem09, Definition 2.2]).

Now we sketch the construction of the entire function in Theorem 1.1. The main idea is to consider a function f which is a canonical product with zeros distributed along the positive real axis and then control the asymptotic behavior of f outside of a small curvilinear sector containing the positive real axis. By applying the Denjoy-Carleman-Ahlfors theorem, we show that the function is in fact bounded in this sector. Since f belongs to the so-called *Laguerre-Pólya class*, using basic properties of functions in this class we see that all the critical points of f are contained in the above sector and hence the set of all critical values is bounded. For this function the only possible asymptotic value is 0, so it is in the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$. Theorem 1.2 then implies that the escaping set of such a function has measure zero.

In 1992, Eremenko and Lyubich [EL92] also gave a condition under which the escaping set of a transcendental entire function in class $\mathcal{B}$ has zero Lebesgue measure. Their condition was formulated in terms of $\theta(r)$ defined above, but in another form. More precisely, they considered transcendental entire functions satisfying

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{\log r} \int_1^r \theta(t)\frac{dt}{t} > 0. \tag{1.12}$$

They show that escaping sets of transcendental entire functions in class $\mathcal{B}$ satisfying (1.12) have zero Lebesgue measure. We call condition (1.12) the *Eremenko-Lyubich condition*. Such a condition implies that for a transcendental entire function in class $\mathcal{B}$, if the set V contains a sector or in other words, f is bounded in a sector, then the area of escaping set is zero. An explicit example that illustrates the power of the Eremenko-Lyubich condition is the above mentioned Mittag-Leffler's function.

Eremenko and Lyubich show that (1.12) is satisfied if f is an entire function of finite order and has a finite logarithmic singular value. Now if, in addition, f belongs to class $\mathcal{B}$ then the escaping set of f has measure zero. We show that this also holds for certain functions of infinite order.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}$ be a transcendental entire function and $r' > 0$. Suppose that the inverse of f has a direct singularity $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose furthermore that f satisfies*

$$\log\log M(r, f) \leq A(r)\log r \tag{1.13}$$

for $r \geq r'$, for some continuous and increasing function $A : [r', \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $A(r) < \log r$ for large r and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A\left(E^k(0)\right)} = \infty. \tag{1.14}$$

Then $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{I}(f) = 0$.

Condition (1.14) implies that $A(r) < \log r$ is only a mild restriction.

Compare the theorem with the result of Eremenko-Lyubich we mentioned above. If the function $A(r)$ is bounded above by some constant, that is, f is of finite order then the condition (1.14) is automatically satisfied. Then the statement of the theorem is exactly that of Eremenko and Lyubich. In this sense, we can view this theorem as a generalization of Eremenko and Lyubich's result mentioned above. Theorem 1.3 will follow from the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}$ be a transcendental entire function and $r' > 0$. Suppose that f satisfies (1.13) and*

$$\frac{1}{\log r}\int_{r^c}^{r} \theta(t)\frac{dt}{t} \geq \frac{1}{A(r)} \tag{1.15}$$

for a constant c with $63/65 \leq c < 1$, and for some continuous and increasing function $A : [r', \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $A(r) < \log r$ for large r and (1.14). Then $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{I}(f) = 0$.

We shall prove this theorem for disjoint type entire functions satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1.4, and then apply a result of Rempe to obtain the result for all functions satisfying the hypotheses of the theorem.

Structure of the article. In section 2 we will give some results that are required for the proof of Theorem 1.2 and then prove this theorem. Then section 3 is devoted to the construction of an example, which on the one hand satisfies conditions in Theorem 1.2 and on the other hand shows the essential sharpness of the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition. Finally, section 4 extends our methods in Theorem 1.2 to the case of infinite-order entire functions in class $\mathcal{B}$, which generalizes the result of Eremenko and Lyubich as claimed.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We will use the notations in (1.2) given in the introduction when applying a logarithmic change of variables. For simplicity, we let $r_0 = e^R$ and hence $H = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z > R\}$. Let F be the function obtained from f by using a logarithmic change of variables. Under the assumption (1.10), the function F is said to be of disjoint type and correspondingly the function f is also said to be of disjoint type. See [Rem09, Definition 2.2] for a discussion of entire functions of disjoint type in class $\mathcal{B}$.

We shall consider the following set

$$T = \{z : F^n(z) \in W, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}.$$

Here $\mathbb{N}_0$ is the set of all non-negative integers. Clearly for the function satisfying (1.10), the Fatou set of f consists of a single immediate attracting basin, and

$$\mathcal{J}(f) = \exp(T).$$

Moreover, the assumption that $f \in \mathcal{B}$ implies that $\mathcal{I}(f) \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$. And since exponential maps preserve sets of zero Lebesgue measure, to show that $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{J}(f) = 0$ (and hence $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{I}(f) = 0$) it suffices to show that $\operatorname{area} T = 0$. In the following

discussion, we will mainly concentrate on this set and prove that the Lebesgue measure of T is zero.

Define

$$T_n = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : F^k(z) \in W, \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, n \right\}$$

and

$$S = \mathbb{C} \setminus T_0 = \mathbb{C} \setminus W. \tag{2.1}$$

By definition of T and T_n, we have

$$T = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} T_n.$$

In the following we shall use the estimate of the modulus of the derivative of F, which is given by Eremenko and Lyubich in [EL92, Lemma 1].

Lemma 2.1 (Expanding property)**.** *Suppose F is obtained through the logarithmic change of variable from f, then*

$$|F'(z)| \geq \frac{\operatorname{Re} F(z) - R}{4\pi} \tag{2.2}$$

for $z \in W$.

For $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, we use the notation $D(z_0, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| < r\}$ and in case of the unit disk we use $\mathbb{D}$.

The following Besicovitch lemma is a standard covering lemma which can be found in [Fal04, Lemma 4.8]. It holds for any bounded set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, but we only use it for sets in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 2.2 (Besicovitch covering lemma)**.** *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded set and $r : Q \to (0, R]$ be a real positive function. Then there exists an at most countable subset L of Q such that*

$$D(x, r(x)) \cap D(y, r(y)) = \emptyset \quad \text{for} \quad x, y \in L, \ x \neq y,$$

and

$$\bigcup_{x \in Q} D(x, r(x)) \subset \bigcup_{x \in L} D(x, 4r(x)).$$

The Koebe distortion theorem and the Koebe one quarter theorem are well-known, see [Pom92, Section 1.3]. We shall use the following version, which can be obtained by an easy argument from that given in [Pom92].

Lemma 2.3 (Koebe's theorem)**.** *Let f be a univalent function in $D(z_0, r)$ and let $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then*

$$\frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^2} |f'(z_0)| \leq \left| \frac{f(z) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0} \right| \leq \frac{\lambda}{(1-\lambda)^2} |f'(z_0)|$$

and

$$\frac{1-\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^3} |f'(z_0)| \leq |f'(z)| \leq \frac{1+\lambda}{(1-\lambda)^3} |f'(z_0)|$$

for $|z - z_0| \leq \lambda r$. *Moreover,*

$$f\left(D(z_0, r)\right) \supset D\left(f(z_0), \frac{1}{4}|f'(z_0)|r\right).$$

Recall the definition of density. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{C}$ be measurable. Then the *density* of A in B is defined to be

$$\operatorname{dens}(A, B) = \frac{\operatorname{area}(A \cap B)}{\operatorname{area} B}.$$

Now we begin our proof of Theorem 1.2. Put

$$c_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\tau R_1}{K^j}, \ K = \frac{R_1 - R}{4\pi} > 1, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\tau > 0$ is some constant to be determined later.

For a point $w \in W$, we consider a sequence of squares centred at w as follows:

$$P_n(w) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Re}(z - w)| \leq \frac{\operatorname{Re} w}{64} - c_n, |\operatorname{Im}(z - w)| \leq \frac{\operatorname{Re} w}{64} - c_n \right\}. \tag{2.4}$$

We write P_n instead of $P_n(w)$ for simplicity. For $z \in T_n$, we define

$$r_n(z) = \frac{\operatorname{Re} F^n(z)}{|(F^n)'(z)|}. \tag{2.5}$$

We show that there exists a countable subset $L_n \subset T_n \cap P_n$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $\bigcup_{z \in T_n \cap P_n} D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \subset \bigcup_{z \in L_n} D(z, 4\tau r_n(z))$;

(ii) $D(z_1, \tau r_n(z_1)) \cap D(z_2, \tau r_n(z_2)) = \emptyset$ for distinct $z_1, z_2 \in L_n$;

(iii) $D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \subset P_{n-1}$, for $z \in L_n$;

(iv) for each $z \in L_n$, the disk $D(z, \tau r_n(z))$ contains a compact subset $A_n(z)$ such that F^n maps $A_n(z)$ bijectively onto a square $Q(z_n)$ centred at $z_n := F^n(z)$ with sidelength $\operatorname{Re} z_n/32$, that is,

$$Q(z_n) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Re}(z - z_n)| \leq \frac{1}{64} \operatorname{Re} z_n, \ |\operatorname{Im}(z - z_n)| \leq \frac{1}{64} \operatorname{Re} z_n \right\}; \tag{2.6}$$

(v) $D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \subset T_{n-1}$, for $z \in L_n$.

The existence of L_n satisfying (i) and (ii) follows from Lemma 2.2. To see that the conclusion (iii) holds, note that $z \in T_n$ and hence $F^k(z) \in W$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$, which in particular means that $\operatorname{Re} F^n(z) > R_1$. Moreover, it follows from (2.2) and (2.3) that

$$|F'(z)| \geq \frac{\operatorname{Re} F(z) - R}{4\pi} \geq \frac{R_1 - R}{4\pi} = K.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}|(F^n)'(z)| &= \left|F'(F^{n-1}(z))\right| \cdot \left|(F^{n-1})'(z)\right| \\ &\geq \frac{\operatorname{Re} F^n(z) - R}{4\pi} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-2} \left|F'(F^j(z))\right| \\ &\geq \frac{\operatorname{Re} F^n(z) - R}{4\pi} \cdot \left(\frac{R_1 - R}{4\pi}\right)^{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $z \in T_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}r_n(z) = \frac{\operatorname{Re} F^n(z)}{|(F^n)'(z)|} &\leq \frac{\operatorname{Re} F^n(z)}{\operatorname{Re} F^n(z) - R} \cdot 4\pi \cdot \left(\frac{4\pi}{R_1 - R}\right)^{n-1} \\ &\leq \frac{R_1}{R_1 - R} \cdot 4\pi \cdot \left(\frac{4\pi}{R_1 - R}\right)^{n-1} \\ &= \left(\frac{4\pi}{R_1 - R}\right)^{n} R_1 \\ &= \frac{R_1}{K^n}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies (iii). Essentially (iv) follows from the above Lemma 2.3. Since $z \in L_n \subset T_n$, by definition of T_n we have $\operatorname{Re} z_k > R_1$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$. Now since

$$\frac{63}{64} \operatorname{Re} z_n > \frac{63}{64} R_1 > \frac{63}{64} \cdot 2R > R,$$

we obtain that $Q(z_n)$ is contained in H. If ϕ is the inverse branch of F which maps z_n to z_{n-1}, then $\phi(Q(z_n))$ is contained in W and hence the preimage of $Q(z_n)$ under the pullback of the inverse branch of F^k which maps z_n to z_{n-k} is contained in W for each $k = 1, \ldots, n$. If we denote by ϕ_n the branch of the inverse of F^n which maps z_n to z, then ϕ_n extends to a univalent map on $D(z_n, \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} z_n)$ since $\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} z_n > \frac{1}{2} R_1 > R$. By using Lemma 2.3 and by taking $\sigma = 1/256$ and $\tau = 1/16$ we have

$$D\left(z, \sigma r_n(z)\right) \subset \phi_n\left(Q(z_n)\right) \subset D\left(z, \tau r_n(z)\right). \tag{2.7}$$

The conclusion (iv) follows if we take

$$A_n(z) = \phi_n\left(Q(z_n)\right).$$

The last conclusion (v) follows if we consider the following square centred at z_n

$$Q'(z_n) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Re}(z - z_n)| \leq \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Re} z_n,\ |\operatorname{Im}(z - z_n)| \leq \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Re} z_n \right\}.$$

Similar arguments as above show that

$$\phi_n\left(Q'(z_n)\right) \subset T_{n-1}$$

and

$$D\left(z, \tau r_n(z)\right) \subset \phi_n\left(Q'(z_n)\right).$$

Therefore, $D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \subset T_{n-1}$ for $z \in L_n$. The conclusion (v) follows.

Now we split our proof into two steps. First we estimate the area of $T_{n-1} \setminus T_n$ in $D(z, \tau r_n(z))$ for $z \in T_n$, which we call *local estimate*. Then we spread the local estimate to a *global estimate*, which is the area of $T_{n-1} \setminus T_n$ in $P_n(w)$, by using the above (i), (ii) and (iii).

First we note that

$$T_{n-1} \setminus T_n = F^{-n}(S) \cap T_{n-1}.$$

Together with (v) above we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap D(z, \tau r_n(z))\right) \\ &= \operatorname{area}\left(F^{-n}(S) \cap T_{n-1} \cap D(z, \tau r_n(z))\right) \\ &= \operatorname{area}\left(F^{-n}(S) \cap D(z, \tau r_n(z))\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Recall our definition of S in (2.1) and $\theta(r)$ in (1.9). We define

$$\varphi(x) = \operatorname{meas}\{\, y \in [0, 2\pi] : x + iy \in S \,\},$$

and

$$\varphi_0(x) = \theta_0(e^x).$$

Then $\varphi(x) = \theta(e^x)$. Since $\theta(x) \geq \theta_0(x)$ for large x, we see that $\varphi(x) \geq \varphi_0(x)$ for large x. Now we can give a lower bound for the area of S in the square $Q(z_n)$ given in (2.6). For simplicity we put $Q = Q(z_n)$. We use the fact that θ_0 is a continuous and decreasing function. Since the square Q contains at least $[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}]$ horizontal strips of width 2π and $\operatorname{Re} z_n > R_1 > 64\pi$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{area}(S \cap Q) &\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \int_{\frac{63}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n}^{\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n} \varphi(t)dt \\ &\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \int_{\frac{63}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n}^{\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n} \varphi_0(t)dt \\ &\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \varphi_0\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n\right) \frac{1}{32} \operatorname{Re} z_n. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Here $[\,\cdot\,]$ denotes the integer part. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{dens}(S,Q) &\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \frac{\varphi_0\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n\right)\frac{1}{32}\operatorname{Re} z_n}{\left(\frac{1}{32}\operatorname{Re} z_n\right)^2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\frac{\varphi_0\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n\right)}{\frac{1}{32}\operatorname{Re} z_n} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi}\varphi_0\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4\pi}\varphi_0\left(2\operatorname{Re} z_n\right) \\ &=: \varphi_1\left(\operatorname{Re} z_n\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

As we mentioned above, ϕ_n, which is the inverse branch of F^n which maps z_n to z, extends to a univalent map on $D(z_n, \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re} z_n)$. Thus by Koebe's theorem, there exist positive constants K_1 and K_2 such that

$$K_1 \operatorname{dens}(S,Q) \leq \operatorname{dens}(\phi_n(S),\phi_n(Q)) \leq K_2 \operatorname{dens}(S,Q)$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by using (2.7) and (2.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{dens}\left(F^{-n}(S), D(z,\tau r_n(z))\right) &= \frac{\operatorname{area}\left(F^{-n}(S)\cap D(z,\tau r_n(z))\right)}{\operatorname{area} D(z,\tau r_n(z))} \\ &\geq \frac{\operatorname{area}\left(\phi_n(S)\cap\phi_n(Q)\right)}{\operatorname{area} D(z,\tau r_n(z))} \\ &\geq \frac{K_1 \operatorname{dens}(S,Q)\cdot \operatorname{area}\phi_n(Q)}{\operatorname{area} D(z,\tau r_n(z))} \\ &\geq \frac{K_1 \operatorname{dens}(S,Q)\cdot \operatorname{area} D(z,\sigma r_n(z))}{\operatorname{area} D(z,\tau r_n(z))} \\ &= K_1\left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\right)^2 \operatorname{dens}(S,Q) \\ &\geq K_1\left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\right)^2 \varphi_1\left(\operatorname{Re} z_n\right). \end{aligned}$$

So by (2.8), for $z \in T_n$ we have, with $\varphi_2(x) = K_1(\sigma/\tau)^2\varphi_1(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1}\setminus T_n \cap D\left(z,\tau r_n(z)\right)\right) \\ &\quad\geq K_1\left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\right)^2 \varphi_1\left(\operatorname{Re} z_n\right)\cdot \operatorname{area} D\left(z,\tau r_n(z)\right) \\ &\quad= \varphi_2(\operatorname{Re} z_n)\cdot \operatorname{area} D(z,\tau r_n(z))). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Since $\rho(f) < 1$, we see that for any point z with large real part,

$$\operatorname{Re} F(z) \leq \exp(\operatorname{Re} z) = E(\operatorname{Re} z),$$

and hence

$$\operatorname{Re} F^k(z) \le E^k(\operatorname{Re} z). \tag{2.12}$$

Now we can deduce our global estimate from the conclusions (i), (ii), (iii), (2.11) and (2.12) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap P_{n-1}\right) \\
&\ge \operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap \bigcup_{z\in L_n} D(z, \tau r_n(z))\right) \\
&= \sum_{z\in L_n} \operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap D(z, \tau r_n(z))\right) \\
&\ge \sum_{z\in L_n} \varphi_2\left(\operatorname{Re} z_n\right) \cdot \operatorname{area} D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \\
&\ge \sum_{z\in L_n} \varphi_2\left(E^n(\operatorname{Re} z)\right) \cdot \operatorname{area} D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \qquad (2.13) \\
&\ge \varphi_2\left(E^n\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right) \sum_{z\in L_n} \operatorname{area} D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \\
&\ge \frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^n\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right) \cdot \operatorname{area}\left(\bigcup_{z\in L_n} D(z, 4\tau r_n(z))\right) \\
&\ge \frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^n\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right) \cdot \operatorname{area}\left(T_n \cap P_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap P_{n-1}\right) &= \operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \cap P_{n-1}\right) - \operatorname{area}\left(T_n \cap P_{n-1}\right) \\
&\le \operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \cap P_{n-1}\right) - \operatorname{area}\left(T_n \cap P_n\right),
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \cap P_{n-1}\right) \ge \left[1 + \frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^n\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)\right] \cdot \operatorname{area}\left(T_n \cap P_n\right).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
P_\infty &= \bigcap_{n\ge 1} P_n \\
&= \left\{z : \ |\operatorname{Re}(z-w)| \le \frac{\operatorname{Re} w}{M} - c, |\operatorname{Im}(z-w)| \le \frac{\operatorname{Re} w}{M} - c\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$c = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tau R_1}{K^j} = \frac{\tau R_1}{K-1}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{area}(T_n \cap P_\infty) &\le \operatorname{area}(T_n \cap P_n)\\ &\le \prod_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^k\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)} \cdot \operatorname{area}(T_1 \cap P_1),\end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\operatorname{area}(T \cap P_\infty) \le \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^k\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)} \cdot \operatorname{area}(T_1 \cap P_1). \tag{2.14}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^k\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right) &= \alpha \cdot \varphi_0\left(2E^k\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)\\ &\ge \alpha \cdot \varphi_0\left(E^{k+2}(\operatorname{Re} w)\right)\\ &= \alpha \cdot \theta_0\left(E^{k+3}(\operatorname{Re} w)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{K_1}{64\pi}(\sigma/\tau)^2$, by condition (1.11) we see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^k\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right) = \infty.$$

This implies that

$$\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{16}\varphi_2\left(E^k\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)} = 0,$$

which, together with (2.14), finishes the proof:

$$\operatorname{area}(T \cap P_\infty) = 0.$$

Since the point $w \in W$ is chosen arbitrarily, we have in particular that $\operatorname{area} T = 0$. By the discussion at the beginning of this section we finally have $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{J}(f) = 0$ and in particular $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{I}(f) = 0$.

3. Construction of an entire function: proof of Theorem 1.1

The aim of this section is to construct an entire function which satisfies our conditions in Theorem 1.1 and hence shows the sharpness of the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition (1.6). Recall that in the introduction we consider $E_\beta(z) = e^{\beta z}$, where $\beta \in (0, 1/e)$. We obtain a local holomorphic solution Φ of the corresponding Schröder's functional equation around the repelling fixed point. Now we define a function $\varepsilon : (\xi, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ by

$$\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\log \Phi(x)}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then this function tends to zero slower than any of the functions $1/\log^m$ where $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The following estimate will be useful.

Lemma 3.1. *For $\varepsilon(x)$ defined above and for $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have the following estimate:*

$$\varepsilon'(x)\prod_{j=0}^{N}\log^j x \le \varepsilon(x)^3 \tag{3.2}$$

for large x.

Proof. We recall how the function Φ in (1.3) is constructed; see, for instance, [Mil06, Section 8]. First let $T_\xi(x) = x+\xi$ and $L_\beta(x) = E_\beta^{-1}(x)$. Define

$$L = T_\xi^{-1} \circ L_\beta \circ T_\xi. \tag{3.3}$$

Thus,

$$L(x) = \frac{\log(x+\xi)}{\beta} - \xi.$$

The function L satisfies that $L(0) = 0$, $L'(0) = 1/\lambda$ (recall that $\lambda = \beta\xi$). Since λ is greater than one, 0 is an attracting fixed point of L. Schröder's functional equation has a unique local holomorphic solution $\Psi(z)$ normalised by $\Psi(0) = 0$ and $\Psi'(0) = 1$, such that

$$\Psi(L(x)) = \frac{1}{\lambda}\Psi(x). \tag{3.4}$$

Then $\Psi(x) = \Phi(x+\xi)$. Define

$$\Psi_n(x) = \lambda^n L^n(x),$$

then $\Psi(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\Psi_n(x)$. We can now compute explicitly the first derivative of Ψ_n:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n'(x) &= \lambda^n \left(L^n\right)'(x) = \lambda^n L'\left(L^{n-1}\right)\cdot\left(L^{n-1}\right)'(x)\\
&= \frac{\lambda^n}{\beta\left(L^{n-1}(x)+\xi\right)}\cdot\left(L^{n-1}\right)'(x) = \lambda^n\prod_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\beta\left(L^j(x)+\xi\right)}\\
&= \left(\frac{\lambda}{\beta\xi}\right)^n\cdot\prod_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{1+L^j(x)/\xi} = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{1+L^j(x)/\xi}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we see that, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n'(x)\prod_{j=0}^{N}\log^j x &= \prod_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{1+L^j(x)/\xi}\prod_{j=0}^{N}\log^j x\\
&= \prod_{j=0}^{N}\frac{\log^j x}{1+L^j(x)/\xi}\prod_{j=N+1}^{n-1}\frac{1}{1+L^j(x)/\xi}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any fixed finite integer N (to our following applications, $N \le 5$ is enough), the definition of $L(x)$ in (3.3) can be put into the above equality. An easy computation shows that

$$\Psi_n'(x)\prod_{j=0}^{N}\log^j x \le \frac{1}{2}, \tag{3.5}$$

for sufficiently large x. If we define

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(x) &= \frac{1}{\log \Psi(x)}, \\ \eta_n(x) &= \frac{1}{\log \Psi_n(x)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

then $\eta(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \eta_n(x)$ and also $\eta'(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \eta_n'(x)$. Then, by applying (3.5) and the definition of $\eta_n(x)$ in (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n'(x) \prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x &= \frac{1}{\left[\log \Psi_n(x)\right]^2} \frac{1}{\Psi_n(x)} \Psi_n'(x) \prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x \leq \frac{1}{2\Psi_n(x) \left[\log \Psi_n(x)\right]^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\left[\log \Psi_n(x)\right]^3} = \frac{1}{2}\eta_n(x)^3. \end{aligned}$$

Now we see that

$$\eta'(x) \prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x \leq \frac{1}{2}\eta(x)^3$$

for large x. Recall the definition of $\varepsilon(x)$ and $\Phi(x)$. We thus have $\eta(x) = \varepsilon(x+\xi)$. For large $x \in (\xi, \infty)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon'(x+\xi) \prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j(x+\xi) &= \left(\eta'(x) \prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x\right) \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j(x+\xi)}{\prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\eta(x)^3 \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j(x+\xi)}{\prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(x+\xi)^3 \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j(x+\xi)}{\prod_{j=0}^{N} \log^j x} \\ &\leq \varepsilon(x+\xi)^3. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes our proof. □

A function $\rho(r)$ defined on $[r_0, \infty)$, where $r_0 > 0$, is called a *proximate order* if it satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $\rho(r) \geq 0$;
(2) $\lim_{r\to\infty} \rho(r) = \rho$;
(3) $\rho(r)$ is continuously differentiable on $[r_0, \infty)$;
(4) $\lim_{r\to\infty} r\rho'(r) \log r = 0$.

See [GO08] for a complete discussion of proximate orders. Recall that $\varepsilon(r)$ is defined in (3.1). Put

$$\rho(r) = \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(r).$$

Now we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *$\rho(r)$ is a proximate order.*

Proof. To show the statement is true we only need to check whether $r\rho'(r)\log r \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. This follows easily from the above lemma. Taking $N = 1$ in (3.2), we see that

$$|r\rho'(r)\log r| = |\varepsilon'(r)r\log r| \leq A[\varepsilon(r)]^3 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty.$$

The other conditions are easy to verify. We omit it here. □

We begin our construction of an entire function. Let $\varepsilon(r)$, $\rho(r)$ be as above. Let $\{a_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ be a positive real sequence tending to infinity which is chosen such that

$$1 \leq a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \dots,$$

and

$$n(r) = r^{\rho(r)} + \mathcal{O}(1), \tag{3.7}$$

where $n(r)$ counts the number of elements a_n which satisfies $a_n \leq r$. Recall that the exponent of convergence of the sequence $\{a_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is defined by

$$\lambda := \inf\left\{\mu > 0 : \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_k^{\mu}} < \infty\right\}.$$

Moreover, it is well known that

$$\lambda = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log n(r)}{\log r}.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\lambda = 1/2$. Therefore, the infinite product

$$f(z) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(1 - \frac{z}{a_n}\right) \tag{3.8}$$

converges locally uniformly and hence it is an entire function. Note that $\varepsilon(r)^3 r^{\rho(r)} \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$. Instead of (3.7) it suffices to assume that

$$n(r) = r^{\rho(r)} + \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon(r)^3 r^{\rho(r)}\right), \tag{3.9}$$

and the infinite product defined in above way is still an entire function. Now we consider the asymptotic behaviour of f outside a small unbounded domain containing the positive real axis. We prove the following important property for the above function f. For a related result, we refer to [BC, Theorem 1.5].

Lemma 3.3 (Asymptotic representation)**.** *For f, ε and ρ defined above, we have*

$$\log|f(re^{i\theta})| = \frac{\pi\cos((\theta-\pi)\rho(r))}{\sin(\pi\rho(r))} r^{\rho(r)} + \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon(r)^2 r^{\rho(r)}\right), \tag{3.10}$$

for

$$\varepsilon(r) \leq \theta \leq 2\pi - \varepsilon(r) \tag{3.11}$$

as $r \to \infty$.

Proof. Following the standard argument using Riemann-Stieltjes integral (see [GO08, Chapter 2, Section 5]), we have

$$\log f(z) = -z \int_0^\infty \frac{n(t,0)}{t(t-z)} dt$$

and

$$I(z) := \int_0^\infty \frac{t^{\rho(r)}}{t(t-z)} dt = -\frac{\pi e^{-i\pi\rho(r)}}{\sin(\pi\rho(r))} z^{\rho(r)-1}, \tag{3.12}$$

defined for $0 < \arg z < 2\pi$. For $z = re^{i\theta}$,

$$\operatorname{Re}(zI(z)) = -\frac{\pi \cos(\rho(r)(\pi-\theta))}{\sin(\pi(\rho(r))} r^{\rho(r)}. \tag{3.13}$$

By (3.9), (3.12) and (3.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\log|f(z)| + \operatorname{Re}(zI(z))| &= \left|\operatorname{Re}\left(z\int_0^\infty \frac{t^{\rho(r)} - n(t,0)}{t(t-z)} dt\right)\right| \\ &\le r\int_0^\infty \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t|t-z|} dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

To estimate the integral on the right-hand side of (3.14), we consider

$$b(r) = \frac{1}{a(r)} = \exp\left\{\varepsilon(r)^3 \log\log r\right\}. \tag{3.15}$$

We claim two properties of $a(r)$ and $b(r)$. First, $b(r) \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$. This follows easily from (3.1) and (1.4), from which we see that $\Phi(r) \le \log^k(r)$ for large r and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, $\varepsilon(r) \ge 1/\log^k(r)$ for any $k \ge 1$. Now the first claim follows. The second one is that, for any positive constant $\delta < 1$,

$$a(r)^\delta = \frac{1}{b(r)^\delta} = o\left(\varepsilon(r)^2\right). \tag{3.16}$$

In fact it can easily be seen that, this is true if the following holds:

$$\frac{\varepsilon^3(r)\log\log r}{\log\varepsilon(r)} \to -\infty.$$

Again, the same argument as above implies this. We omit details here.

Now following the argument in the proof of Theorem 2.2 in [GO08, Chapter 2, Section 2], for every $k \in [a(r), b(r)]$ there exists $k^* \in [a(r), b(r)]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho(kr) - \rho(r)| &= k^* r\,|\rho'(k^* r)|\,|\log k| \\ &= k^* r\,|\rho'(k^* r)|\,|\log(k^* r)|\,\frac{|\log k|}{|\log(k^* r)|}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

By Lemma 3.2, $\rho(r)$ is a proximate order. The definition of proximate orders and Lemma 3.1 then imply that

$$k^* r\,|\rho'(k^* r)|\,|\log(k^* r)| = k^* r\,|\varepsilon'(k^* r)|\,|\log(k^* r)| \le \frac{1}{\log\log(k^* r)} \tag{3.18}$$

for large r. Recall that $a(r)$ and $b(r)$ are defined in (3.15). Since $k \le b(r)$ and $k^* \ge a(r)$, we see that

$$\frac{|\log k|}{|\log(k^* r)|} \le \frac{\log b(r)}{\log(r a(r))} = \frac{\log b(r)}{\log r - \log b(r)} = \frac{\varepsilon(r)^3 \log\log r}{\log r - \varepsilon(r)^3 \log\log r}, \tag{3.19}$$

which, by a simple computation, (3.17) and (3.18), yields

$$|\rho(kr) - \rho(r)| \le (1 + o(1)) \frac{\varepsilon(r)^3}{\log r} \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty.$$

Therefore we see that, for all such k,

$$\begin{aligned} r^{\rho(kr)-\rho(r)} &= \exp\{(\rho(kr) - \rho(r)) \log r\} \\ &= \exp\left\{(1 + o(1))\varepsilon(r)^3\right\} \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Take $\delta = 1/4$, then $\delta < \min\{\rho(t), 1 - \rho(t)\}$ for large t since $\rho(t) \to 1/2$ by definition. Moreover, note that for such δ, we have the estimate (3.16). Now we separate the integral on the right-hand side of (3.14) into three parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t - z|} dt = &\int_0^{a(r)r} \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t - z|} dt + \int_{b(r)r}^\infty \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t - z|} dt \\ &+ \int_{a(r)r}^{b(r)r} \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t - z|} dt. \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral, by using standard properties of the proximate order, (3.16), (3.20), and the fact that for $t \in [0, a(r)r]$, we have $|t - z| \ge r(1 - a(r)) \ge r/2$, we find that there exists a constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{a(r)r} \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t - z|} dt &\le \frac{C}{r} \left\{ \int_1^{a(r)r} t^{\rho(t)-1} dt + \int_1^{a(r)r} t^{\rho(r)-1} dt \right\} \\ &\le C a(r)^\delta r^{\rho(r)-1} \\ &= o\left(\varepsilon(r)^2 r^{\rho(r)-1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

For the second integral, $|t - z| \ge t/2$ for $t \ge b(r)r$ and same reason as above result in the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{b(r)r}^\infty \frac{\left|n(t,0) - t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t - z|} dt &\le C \left\{ \int_{b(r)r}^\infty t^{\rho(t)-2} dt + \int_{b(r)r}^\infty t^{\rho(r)-2} dt \right\} \\ &\le C \frac{1}{b(r)^\delta} r^{\rho(r)-1} \\ &= C a(r)^\delta r^{\rho(r)-1} \\ &= o\left(\varepsilon(r)^2 r^{\rho(r)-1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

For $t \in [a(r)r, b(r)r]$ and $z = re^{i\theta}$, we have $|t-z| \geq (t+r)\sin\frac{\varepsilon(r)}{2}$. Combining this with (3.9) and (3.20), we can obtain an estimate of the last integral as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{a(r)r}^{b(r)r} \frac{\left|n(t,0)-t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t-z|}dt &\leq \int_{a(r)r}^{b(r)r} \frac{\left|n(t,0)-t^{\rho(t)}\right|}{t\,|t-z|}dt \\ &\quad + \int_{a(r)r}^{b(r)r} \frac{\left|t^{\rho(t)}-t^{\rho(r)}\right|}{t\,|t-z|}dt \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\sin\frac{\varepsilon(r)}{2}} \int_{a(r)r}^{b(r)r} \frac{\varepsilon(t)^3\, t^{\rho(t)}}{t\,(t+r)}dt \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\varepsilon(r)^2}{r}\int_{a(r)}^{b(r)} \frac{(\tau r)^{\rho(\tau r)}}{\tau\,(1+\tau)}d\tau\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon(r)^2\, r^{\rho(r)-1}\int_0^{\infty} \frac{\tau^{\rho(r)}}{\tau\,(1+\tau)}d\tau\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon(r)^2\, r^{\rho(r)-1}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Putting all the estimates (3.14), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23) together, we see that for $z = re^{i\theta}$ with θ satisfying (3.11), $\log|f(z)|$ has the following asymptotic representation:

$$|\log|f(z)| + \mathrm{Re}(zI(z))| = \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon(r)^2 r^{\rho(r)}\right).$$

□

In the following, for some $r_0 > 0$ we define

$$\gamma^+ = \left\{re^{i\varepsilon(r)} : r \geq r_0\right\},$$
$$\gamma^- = \left\{re^{-i\varepsilon(r)} : r \geq r_0\right\},$$

and

$$G(\gamma) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \left\{re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{C} : \varepsilon(r) \leq \theta \leq 2\pi - \varepsilon(r),\ r \geq r_0\right\}.$$

A consequence of the above lemma is the following fact.

Lemma 3.4. *The function f is bounded on γ^+ and γ^-.*

Proof. This follows from the asymptotic representation of f given in Lemma 3.3. For sufficiently large r,

$$\rho(r)(\pi - \varepsilon(r)) = \frac{\pi}{2} + \varepsilon(r)\left(\pi - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon(r)\right) > \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\cos\left(\rho(r)(\pi-\varepsilon(r)\right) &= -\sin\left(\varepsilon(r)\left(\pi - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon(r)\right)\right) \\ &= -(1+o(1))\left(\pi - \frac{1}{2}\right)\varepsilon(r).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon(r)^2 = o\left(\varepsilon(r)\right)$, it follows from the asymptotic representation of $\log|f|$ in Lemma 3.3 that

$$\log\left|f(re^{i\theta})\right| < 0,$$

for $|\theta| = \varepsilon(r)$ and for r sufficiently large. □

Lemma 3.5. *$f(z)$ is bounded in $G(\gamma)$.*

Proof. By Denjoy-Carleman-Ahlfors-Theorem, if g is entire then the number of components of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |g(z)| > R\}$ for $R > 0$ is less than or equal to $\max\{1, 2\rho(g)\}$, where $\rho(g)$ is the order of g. Therefore, for our function f, which is constructed in (3.8) and has order of growth $1/2$, it has at most one tract. However, the asymptotic formula (3.10) for f in Lemma 3.3 implies that $f(z)$ is unbounded when z goes to infinity along the negative real axis. So this means that f has a tract containing the negative real axis. By Lemma 3.4 f is bounded on γ^+ and γ^-. Therefore, the only tract of f should be contained in $\mathbb{C} \setminus G(\gamma)$, which means that f is bounded in $G(\gamma)$. □

To show the entire function f we constructed in (3.8) is in the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$, we need to prove the set of all critical values and asymptotic values of f is bounded. It turns out that the function f belongs to the *Laguerre-Pólya class* $\mathcal{LP}$. We say a function $g \in \mathcal{LP}$ if g is the locally uniform limit of real polynomials with only real zeros. Clearly f has this property since

$$f(z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} P_n(z),$$

where

$$P_n(z) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{z}{a_k}\right).$$

Lemma 3.6. *The function f constructed in (3.8) is in the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. As noted above, $P_n \to f$ locally uniformly. Thus also $P_n' \to f'$. Since all the polynomials P_n' have only real positive zeros, Hurwitz's theorem implies that all zeros of f' are also real and positive. So f has only real positive critical points. As $[r_0, \infty)$ lies in the unbounded domain $G(\gamma)$ defined above, Lemma 3.5 means that the set of critical values of f is bounded. Moreover, f at most one asymptotic value by the Denjoy-Carleman-Ahlfors theorem. Therefore, f belongs to the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$. □

To show that the escaping set of the function we constructed above has zero Lebesgue measure, we need to apply Theorem 1.2. To do this, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *For $\varepsilon(x) = 1/(\log \Phi(x))$ and $x > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon\left(E^k(x)\right) = \infty.$$

Proof. Recall that $E_\beta(x) = e^{\beta x}$, $E(x) = e^x$. We shall show first that, for any given x_1 there exists $x_2 > x_1$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_\beta^k(x_2) \geq E^k(x_1).$$

To see this we first consider the following real function defined as

$$F_\beta(x) = \beta e^x.$$

In particular, $F_1(x) = E(x)$. An easy computation shows that $F_\beta(\beta x) = \beta E_\beta(x)$. Let $c > \log(2/\beta)$ and $e^x > c$. We have

$$F_\beta(x+c) = \beta e^c e^x > 2e^x > e^x + c = F_1(x) + c > F_1(x).$$

Since for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $E^k(x) > c$, by induction we have

$$F_\beta^k(x+c) \geq F_1^k(x) + c > F_1^k(x). \tag{3.24}$$

If we take $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = (x+c)/\beta$, then

$$F_\beta^k(x+c) = F_\beta^k(\beta x_2) = \beta E_\beta^k(x_2).$$

Together with (3.24) we see that

$$E_\beta^k(x_2) > \beta E_\beta^k(x_2) = F_\beta^k(x+c) > F_1^k(x_1) = E^k(x_1).$$

Our assertion now follows. So for $x > 0$ there exists $x' > x$ with $E_\beta^k(x') > E^k(x)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon(E^k(x)) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log \Phi\left(E^k(x)\right)} \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log \Phi\left(E_\beta^k(x')\right)} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log\left(\lambda^k \Phi(x')\right)} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k \log \lambda + \log \Phi(x')} \\
&= \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We consider the transcendental entire function f constructed in (3.8) which satisfies (3.9). Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 together imply that f belongs to the class $\mathcal{B}$ and is bounded in $G(\gamma)$. Since

$$\varepsilon(r) = \frac{1}{\log \Phi(r)},$$

to show that the Lebesgue measure of $\mathcal{I}(f)$ of f is zero, we shall apply our Theorem 1.2. This is equivalent to saying that

$$2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon\left(E^k(x)\right) = 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log \Phi\left(E^k(x)\right)} = \infty. \tag{3.25}$$

Now Lemma 3.7 implies (3.25) is valid. Now, we need to check that the condition (1.7) is satisfied. This follows from our Lemma 3.3, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}\log M(r,f) &\leq \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi\rho(r))}r^{\rho(r)} + \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon(r)^2 r^{\rho(r)}\right)\\ &= (1+o(1))\,\pi r^{\rho(r)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\log\log M(r,f) &\leq \log r^{\rho(r)} + \mathcal{O}(1)\\ &= \rho(r)\log r + \mathcal{O}(1)\\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon(r)\right)\log r + \mathcal{O}(1).\end{aligned}$$

By considering $\lambda f(z)$ for a sufficiently small positive constant λ if necessary, the conditions in Theorem 1.2 are satisfied, which means that $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{J}(f) = 0$ and in particular $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(f) = 0$. □

Remark 3.1. The function we constructed above shows the sharpness of the Aspenberg-Bergweiler condition (1.6) in the case of only one logarithmic tract over infinity. To obtain an entire function with any finite number, say N, logarithmic tracts over infinity, we let f be as in Theorem 1.1 and let $g(z) = f(z)^N$ and $h(z) = f(z^N)$. Then h is in class $\mathcal{B}$ and has N logarithmic tracts over infinity. Moreover, the function h satisfies that

$$\log\log M(r,h) \leq \left(\frac{N}{2} + \frac{N}{\log\Phi(r)}\right)\log r + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Now we need to show that for such function h we have $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(h) = 0$. This follows since $z \in \mathcal{I}(h)$ if and only if $z^N \in \mathcal{I}(g)$. Thus $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(h) = 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(g) = 0$. Now $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(g) = 0$ by the same argument that gives $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(f) = 0$. Hence $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(h) = 0$.

4. Adaption to infinite-order entire functions

We shall use some definitions and some basic facts from value distribution theory of meromorphic functions. See, for example, [GO08] and [Hay64] for an introduction to the theory. We denote by $T(r,f)$ the *Nevanlinna characteristic* of a meromorphic functions f, and by $m(r,f)$ the *proximity function* of f. The order of growth of a meromorphic function f is defined as follows:

$$\rho(f) = \limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T(r,f)}{\log r}. \tag{4.1}$$

Compare (1.1) and (4.1). When f is an entire function, $T(r,f)$ can be replaced by the term $\log M(r,f)$. A more precise relation between $T(r,f)$ and $\log M(r,f)$ when f is entire is given by the following result. Moreover, we also need a fundamental result due to Nevanlinna. Note that the results below can be found in [GO08, Chapter 1].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f(z)$ be an entire function, and let $0 < r < R$. Then*

$$T(r, f) \leq \log M(r, f) \leq \frac{R + r}{R - r} T(R, f). \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.2 (First fundamental theorem of Nevanlinna theory)**.**

$$T(r, f) = T\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a}\right) + \mathcal{O}(1). \tag{4.3}$$

We note that the second inequality in (4.2) is even true when $M(r, f)$ is replaced by $M_G(r, f)$ for a meromorphic function f with a logarithmic tract G over ∞. Here $M_G(r, f) = \max_{z \in G, |z|=r} |f(z)|$. For convenience we state it as follows and refer to [Nev70, Chapter XI, Section 4.3] for a proof.

Lemma 4.3. *Let f be a meromorphic function with a logarithmic tract G over infinity and let $0 < r < R$. Then*

$$\log M_G(r, f) \leq \frac{R + r}{R - r} \left(T(R, f) + \mathcal{O}(1)\right). \tag{4.4}$$

Dynamics of meromorphic functions with direct or logarithmic singularities share many properties with those of entire functions. We refer to [BRS08] for detailed discussions of dynamics of these functions.

We recall the following result due to Tsuji [Tsu75], which is connected to the proof of Denjoy-Carleman-Ahlfors theorem. See, for instance, [GO08, Chapter 5]. To formulate it precisely, we need some notations. For an unbounded domain G with boundary Γ and $r > 0$ such that $\{z : |z| = r\} \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset$, denote by

$$\beta(r) = \operatorname{meas}\left\{\theta \in [0, 2\pi] : re^{i\theta} \in G\right\}.$$

If $\{z : |z| = r\} \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$ then we define $\beta(r) = \infty$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let G be an unbounded domain and Γ its boundary. Let f be continuous in $G \cup \Gamma$ and holomorphic in G. Suppose that f is bounded on Γ but unbounded in G. Then*

$$\log \log M_G(r, f) \geq \pi \int_{r_1}^{\alpha r} \frac{dt}{t\beta(t)} + \mathcal{O}(1),$$

where $r_1 > 0$, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

In our case, we can take the unbounded domain G to be a logarithmic tract over ∞ and $\beta(r)$ the corresponding measure in this tract. Furthermore, by choosing $r_1 > 0$ large enough such that $\{z : |z| = r\} \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset$ we have $\beta(r) > 0$ for $r \geq r_1$.

As mentioned in the introduction, the proof of Theorem 1.4 is only a slightly modified version of that of Theorem 1.2 if we require our entire function f to be of disjoint type, satisfying conditions in Theorem 1.2. To transfer to entire functions not being of disjoint type, we use a result of Rempe [Rem09, Theorem 1.1]. To formulate his result we need the notion of quasiconformal equivalence near infinity. We refer the reader to [Ahl66] for some basic background on quasiconformal mappings. Two entire functions $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$ are *quasiconformally equivalent near* ∞ if there exist quasiconformal mappings $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\psi(f(z)) = g(\varphi(z)) \tag{4.5}$$

whenever $|f(z)|$ or $|g(\varphi(z))|$ is large enough. Then Rempe's result roughly says that quasiconformal equivalence near ∞ implies quasiconformal conjugacy on some subset of the plane. More precisely, he shows

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$ be quasiconformally equivalent near infinity. Then there exist $R > 0$ and a quasiconformal map $\theta : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\theta \circ f = g \circ \theta \quad on \quad \mathcal{J}_R(f) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |f^n(z)| \geq R \quad for\ all \quad n \geq 1\}.$$

Futhermore, θ has zero dilatation on $\{z \in \mathcal{J}_R(f) : |f^n(z)| \to \infty\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. For the function f given in the theorem, we define

$$g(z) := \lambda f(z),$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant to be determined later. Then $g \in \mathcal{B}$. So we can apply a logarithmic change of variables to g and hence we obtain a function G, corresponding to g, such that G is a biholomophic map from every component of W onto H', where

$$H' = \{\ z \in \mathbb{C} :\ \operatorname{Re} z > \log r_0 + \log \lambda\ \}.$$

Now the constant λ is chosen sufficiently small such that

$$\inf\{\operatorname{Re} z :\ z \in W\} > 2(\log r_0 + \log \lambda)$$

and

$$\inf\{\operatorname{Re} z :\ z \in W\} - (\log r_0 + \log \lambda) > 64\pi.$$

Therefore, for the function g defined above satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1.2 by taking

$$R_1 := \inf\{\ \operatorname{Re} z :\ z \in W\ \}.$$

Now the proof of the theorem is similar to that of Theorem 1.2. We choose a point w with large real part and a sequence of squares $P_n(w)$ exactly the same as those in (2.4). In the same way we define the sets T_n and S. Now there exists a countable subset L_n of $T_n \cap P_n$ which satisfies conditions (i)-(v) as before. Now the proof follows if we can obtain appropriate estimates: the local estimate and the global estimate.

The local estimate is achieved by using the inequality (1.15). In terms of φ, where $\varphi(x) = \theta(e^x)$, the condition (1.15) can be written as

$$\int_{cx}^{x} \varphi(s)ds = \int_{e^{cx}}^{e^x} \varphi(\log t)\frac{dt}{t} = \int_{e^{cx}}^{e^x} \theta(t)\frac{dt}{t} \geq \frac{x}{A(e^x)} = \frac{x}{A(E(x))}. \tag{4.6}$$

Then since $63/65 \leq c < 1$, by letting $z_n := G^n(z)$ we obtain, instead of (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{area}(S \cap Q) &\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \int_{\frac{63}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n}^{\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n} \varphi(t)dt \\
&\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \int_{c\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n}^{\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n} \varphi(t)dt \\
&\geq \left[\frac{\operatorname{Re} z_n}{64\pi}\right] \frac{\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n}{A(E(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} z_n))},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\operatorname{dens}(S, Q) \geq \frac{C_0}{A\left(E^2(\operatorname{Re} z_n)\right)}$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$. Therefore, we obtain the following local estimate as in (2.11) by using Koebe's theorem as before:

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap D\left(z, \tau r_n(z)\right)\right) \\ &\geq \frac{C_1}{A\left(E^2(\operatorname{Re} z_n)\right)} \cdot \operatorname{area} D\left(z, \tau r_n(z)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where C_1 is some positive constant.

To spread this to the global estimate, we need the fact that $A(r) < \log r$ for large r. So in this way we have an estimate for $\operatorname{Re} G(z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} G(z) &\leq \log M(e^{\operatorname{Re} z}, g) \\ &\leq \exp\left(A(e^{\operatorname{Re} z}) \cdot \operatorname{Re} z\right) \\ &\leq \exp^2(\operatorname{Re} z), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\operatorname{Re} z_n = \operatorname{Re} G^n(z) \leq \exp^{2n}(\operatorname{Re} z) = E^{2n}(\operatorname{Re} z).$$

Now by using (4.7) the global estimate, which is similar to (2.13), is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap P_{n-1}\right) &\geq \sum_{z \in L_n} \operatorname{area}\left(T_{n-1} \setminus T_n \cap D(z, \tau r_n(z))\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{z \in L_n} \frac{C_1}{A\left(E^2(\operatorname{Re} z_n)\right)} \cdot \operatorname{area} D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \\ &\geq \frac{C_1}{A\left(E^{2n+2}\left(\frac{65}{64} \operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)} \sum_{z \in L_n} \operatorname{area} D(z, \tau r_n(z)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{16} \frac{C_1}{A\left(E^{2n+2}\left(\frac{65}{64} \operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)} \cdot \operatorname{area}\left(T_n \cap P_n\right). \end{aligned}$$

This, as in (2.14), implies that

$$\operatorname{area}\left(T \cap P_\infty\right) \leq \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{16} \frac{C_1}{A\left(E^{2n+2}\left(\frac{65}{64} \operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)}} \cdot \operatorname{area}\left(T_1 \cap P_1\right).$$

Since the function $A(r)$ is increasing, we see that for real x,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A(E^k(x))} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A(E^{2k}(x))} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A(E^{2k-1}(x))} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A(E^{2k}(x))} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A(E^{2k-2}(x))} \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A(E^{2k}(x))} + \frac{1}{A(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

The condition (1.14) is then applied to obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{A\left(E^{2n+2}\left(\frac{65}{64}\operatorname{Re} w\right)\right)} = \infty.$$

The rest is the same as before and we omit details here. Therefore, we see that $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{J}(g) = 0$ for the disjoint type function g.

We still need to transfer this result to our original function f. Note that our functions f and g are quasiconformally equivalent near infinity. Therefore, Theorem 4.1 implies that there exist R' and a quasiconformal mapping $\theta : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\theta \circ g = f \circ \theta$$

on the set

$$\mathcal{J}_{R'}(g) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |g^n(z)| \geq R' \text{ for all } n \geq 1\}.$$

If we put

$$\mathcal{I}_{R'}(g) = \mathcal{I}(g) \cap \mathcal{J}_{R'}(g),$$

then $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{I}_{R'}(g) = 0$ since $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{J}(g) = 0$ and $\mathcal{I}(g) \subset \mathcal{J}(g)$. Now we see that there exists a constant $R'' > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{I}_{R''}(f) \subset \theta\left(\mathcal{I}_{R'}(g)\right).$$

Recall that

$$\mathcal{I}(f) = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}\left(\mathcal{I}_{R''}(f)\right).$$

Therefore, it is clear that $\operatorname{area} \mathcal{I}(f) = 0$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We define

$$g(z) = \frac{1}{f(z) - a}.$$

Since $f(z)$ has a finite direct singular value a, then $g(z)$ has a direct tract over infinity. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, and denote

$$\alpha(r) := \operatorname{meas}\left\{t \in [0, 2\pi] : \left|f(re^{it}) - a\right| < \varepsilon\right\}.$$

We will follow the notations given in the introduction with respect to f. Recall that $\theta(r) = \operatorname{meas}\left\{t \in [0, 2\pi] : |f(re^{it})| < e^R\right\}$, which is defined in (1.9). By choosing $R > 0$ large enough we can have $e^R > |a| + \varepsilon$. Therefore, we see that

$$\theta(r) \geq \alpha(r) \tag{4.8}$$

holds for large r. On the other hand, $\alpha(r)$ also denotes the linear measure of the set $U_0 := \{t \in [0, 2\pi] : |g(re^{it})| > 1/\varepsilon\}$. Applying Lemma 4.4 to the function g, with $G = U_0$ and $\beta(r) = \alpha(r)$ we see that

$$\log\log M_{U_0}(r, g) \geq \pi \int_{r_1}^{\alpha_0 r} \frac{dt}{t \cdot \alpha(t)} + \mathcal{O}(1), \tag{4.9}$$

where $r_1 > 0$ and $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$. This, together with (4.8), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\log\log M_{U_0}(r,g) &\geq \pi \int_{r_1}^{\alpha_0 r} \frac{dt}{t\cdot\theta(t)} + \mathcal{O}(1)\\ &\geq \pi \int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r} \frac{dt}{t\cdot\theta(t)} + \mathcal{O}(1).\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Then by applying Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, and by taking $R = 2r$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\log M_{U_0}(r,g) &\leq 3T(2r,g) + \mathcal{O}(1)\\ &= 3T(2r,f) + \mathcal{O}(1)\\ &\leq 3\log M(2r,f) + \mathcal{O}(1).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\pi \int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r} \frac{dt}{t\cdot\theta(t)} &\leq \log\log M(2r,f) + \mathcal{O}(1)\\ &\leq A(2r)\log(2r) + \mathcal{O}(1).\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\log(\alpha_0 r)^{1-c}\right)^2 &= \left(\int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r} \frac{dt}{t}\right)^2 = \left(\int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r} \sqrt{\frac{\theta(t)}{t}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta(t)t}}dt\right)^2\\ &\leq \int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r} \theta(t)\frac{dt}{t}\cdot\int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r}\frac{dt}{\theta(t)\cdot t}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.11) we see that

$$\frac{1}{\log r}\int_{(\alpha_0 r)^c}^{\alpha_0 r}\theta(t)\frac{dt}{t} \geq \frac{C_0}{A(2r)} \tag{4.12}$$

for large r, where $C_0 > 0$ is some constant. Thus, we obtain from (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\log r}\int_{r^c}^{r}\theta(t)\frac{dt}{t} &\geq \frac{1}{\log(r/\alpha_0)}\int_{(r)^c}^{r}\theta(t)\frac{dt}{t}\\ &\geq \frac{C_0}{A(2r/\alpha_0)} := A_0(r).\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Thus, (1.15) is satisfied with $A(r)$ replaced by $A_0(r)$. Moreover, by using (1.14) it is easy to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{A_0(E^k(0))} = \infty. \tag{4.14}$$

Therefore, we can apply Theorem 1.4 to obtain that $\operatorname{area}\mathcal{I}(f) = 0$.

□

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank his Ph.D. supervisor Walter Bergweiler for his introduction to the research problem and also for his constant help and guidance.

References

[AB12] M. Aspenberg and W. Bergweiler, *Entire functions with Julia sets of positive measure*, Math. Ann. **352** (2012), no. 1, 27–54.

[Ahl66] L. V. Ahlfors, *Lectures on quasiconformal mappings*, vol. 38, AMS Providence, Rhode Island, 1966.

[BC] W. Bergweiler and I. Chyzhykov, *Lebesgue measure of escaping sets of entire functions of completely regular growth*, arxiv: 1510.03628, to appear in J. London Math. Soc.

[BE95] W. Bergweiler and A. Eremenko, *On the singularities of the inverse to a meromorphic function of finite order*, Rev. Mat. Iber. **11** (1995), 355–373.

[Ber93] W. Bergweiler, *Iteration of meromorphic functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1993), no. 2, 151–188.

[BRS08] W. Bergweiler, P. J. Rippon, and G. M. Stallard, *Dynamics of meromorphic functions with direct or logarithmic singularities*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **97** (2008), no. 2, 368–400.

[EL92] A. Eremenko and M. Lyubich, *Dynamical properties of some classes of entire functions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **42** (1992), no. 4, 989–1020.

[Ere89] A. Eremenko, *On the iteration of entire functions*, in Dynamical Systems and Ergodic Theory, Banach Center Publ. **23** (1989), 339–345.

[Fal04] K. J. Falconer, *Fractal geometry: Mathematical foundations and applications*, John Wiley & Sons, 2004.

[Fat26] P. Fatou, *Sur l'itération des fonctions transcendantes entières*, Acta Math. **47** (1926), no. 4, 337–370.

[GO08] A.A. Goldberg and I.V. Ostrovskii, *Value distribution of meromorphic functions*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs 236, American Mathematical Society, 2008.

[Hay64] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Oxford University Press, 1964.

[McM87] C. T. McMullen, *Area and Hausdorff dimension of Julia sets of entire functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **300** (1987), no. 1, 329–342.

[Mil06] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in one complex variable*, Annals of Mathemtaics Studies 160, Princeton University Press, 2006.

[Nev70] R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic functions*, Springer-Verlag, 1970.

[Pom92] Ch. Pommerenke, *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 299, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.

[Rem09] L. Rempe, *Rigidity of escaping dynamics for transcendental entire functions*, Acta Math. **203** (2009), no. 2, 235–267.

[Sch09] D. Schleicher, *Dynamics of entire functions*, Complex Dynamics–Families and Friends (D. Schleicher, ed.), 2009, pp. 295–339.

[Tsu75] M. Tsuji, *Potential theory in modern function theory*, Chelsea Publishing Company, 1975.

Mathematiches Seminar, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Ludewig-Meyn-Str. 4, D-24098 Kiel, Germany.

E-mail address: cui@math.uni-kiel.de